REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The specification has been amended to remove a single "." on an otherwise blank line (i.e., line 4 of page 29). Claims 1-31 are pending. Claim 1 is amended to correct a minor error in grammar (i.e., to add the article "[a]" before the noun "[m]ethod). This claim grammar amendment does not introduce substance that requires additional evaluation by the Office. No claims are cancelled or added.

In view of the following arguments, withdrawal of all outstanding rejections to pending claims 1-31 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 1-31 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,342,907 to Petty et al ("Petty") in view of U.S. Patent no. 6,456,303 to Walden et al. This rejection is traversed.

In addressing independent claim 1, the Office action ("Action"), admits that Petty does not teach "generating a second Web page comprising the context sensitive information" and "providing the second Web page to the second computer for presentation", as claim 1 recites. For this missing teaching, the Action points to Walden, concluding that it would have been obvious "to modify the providing context sensitive help as taught by Petty et al. to include the generating and providing a second Web page of Walden, with the motivation being to simultaneously display a context of a computer program and a help information as taught by Walden. This conclusion is unsupportable.

Referring to the MPEP §2146, it is fundamental to patent law under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) that subject matter developed by another which qualifies as "prior

LEA & HAYES, PLLC   14   G:\MSI-071\us\MSI-71\US.M01.doc

PAGE 15/19 * RCVD AT 3/17/2004 2:18:05 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/0 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:3035390271 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-36

art" only under one or more of subsections 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) and (g) is not to be considered when determining whether an invention sought to be patented is obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, provided the subject matter and the claimed invention were commonly owned at the time the invention was made. U.S. Patent no. 6,456,303 to Walden et al. ("Walden"), the reference secondarily relied on by the Action, qualifies as prior art only under 35 USC §102(e). Applicant has made an affirmative investigation to determine that Walden was commonly owned by the assignee at the time of invention of the subject matter pertaining to the present application. Thus, Walden is not a proper reference for a 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 1.

Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 1 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-9 depend from claim 1 and are allowable over the cited combination by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 2-8 should be withdrawn.

Claim 10 recites in part "generating a second Web page comprising the context-sensitive help", and "communicating the second Web page to the second computer for presentation." The Action concedes on page 1 that Petty does not teach or suggest these recited features of claim 10. Moreover, as per 35 USC §103(c), Walden is not a proper reference for a 35 USC 103(a) rejection of the features of claim 10. Thus, a prima facie case of obvious of these recited features cannot be made in view of the cited combination.

Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 10 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Lee & Hayes, PLLC

15

G:\WSI-0174\wAMSI-741USLvDI.doc

PAGE 16/19 * RCVD AT 3/17/2004 2:18:05 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/0 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:3035390271 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-36

Claims 11-18 depend from claim 10 and are allowable over the cited combination by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 11-18 should be withdrawn.

Claim 19 recites in part "responsive to receiving a request for context sensitive help, determining a set of context-sensitive help that corresponds to the Web-based UI", and "communicating the context-sensitive help to the different system for presentation." The Action concedes on page 1 that Petty does not teach or suggest these recited features of claim 19. Moreover, as per 35 USC §103(c), Walden is not a proper reference for a 35 USC 103(a) rejection of the features of claim 19. Thus, a prima facie case of obvious of these recited features cannot be made in view of the cited combination.

Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 19 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 20-25 depend from claim 19 and are allowable over the cited combination by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, the respective 35 USC §103(a) rejections of claims 20-25 are improper and should be withdrawn.

Clam 26 recites in part "[a] user interface comprising [...] a first area for displaying, on a first device, a remote UI that corresponds to a second device", and "a second area within the first area for providing a context-sensitive help control for accessing a set of context sensitive help that corresponds to the remote user interface." The Action rejects these claimed features for the same reasons that the Action rejected the features of claims 1, 10, and 19. However, Petty does not teach or suggest these recited features of claim 26.

Instead, Petty teaches a panel building tool to generate a platform UI independent panel based on Panel Definition Markup Language (PDML) – col. 3,

lines 22-30, and col. 7, lines 23-49. Petty also teaches that if the programmer desired to map context sensitive help to components of the PDML panel, that the programmer must interface with a help generator tool to generate the context sensitive help (col. 3, lines 30-37, and col. 7, lines 50-56). The "[h]elp generator tool 129 is a tool that helps a programmer generate context sensitive help for a PDML panel. Help generator tool 129 defines a 'help skeleton' with headings that correspond to components on the PDML panel. A programmer can then add text or other features to the help skeleton to generate one or more help screens that corresponds to a user interface panel 124 defined in PDML."

These teachings of Petty are completely silent with respect to "[a] user interface comprising [...] a first area for displaying, on a first device, a remote UI that corresponds to a second device", and "a second area within the first area for providing a context-sensitive help control for accessing a set of context sensitive help that corresponds to the remote user interface", as claim 26 recites. Additionally, 35 USC §103(c) specifies that the Action may not rely on Petty in view of Walden for these missing features.

Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 26 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 27-31 depend from claim 26 and are allowable over the cited combination by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, the respective 35 USC §103(a) rejections of claims 27-31 are improper and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Claims 1-31 are in condition for allowance and action to that end is respectfully requested. Should any issue remain that prevents allowance of the application, the Office is encouraged to contact the undersigned prior or issuance of a subsequent Office action

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: _03/17/04_   By: _____

Brian G. Hart
Reg. No. 44,421
(303) 539-0265

LEE & HAYES, PLLC   18   G:\MSI-0174\us\MSI-741US.M01.doc